arXiv:1302.4429v1 [math.DG] 16 Feb 2013

On ϕ-Recurrent (κ, μ)-Contact Metric Manifolds

E. Peyghan and A. Tayebi

February 20, 2013

Abstract

In this paper, we show that there is no ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold. Then we prove that the only flat 3-dimensional manifolds are ϕ-recurrent (k, μ)-contact metric manifolds.

Keywords: Locally ϕ-symmetric, Sasakian manifold, (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold, ϕ-recurrent.[1]

1 Introduction

Local symmetry is a very strong condition for the class of Sasakian manifolds. Indeed, such spaces must have constant curvature equal to 1 [8]. Thus Takahashi introduced the notion of a (locally) ϕ-symmetric space in the context of Sasakian geometry [9]. Generalizing the notion of ϕ-symmetry, De-Shaikh-Biswas introduced the notion of ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold [6]. In [5], Boeckx-Buecken-Vanhecke introduced and studied the notion of ϕ-symmetry with several examples. In [4], Boeckx proved that every non-Sasakian (κ, μ)-manifold is locally ϕ-symmetric in the strong sense.

In [7], Jun-Yildiz-De introduced a type of (κ, μ)-contact metric manifolds called ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold which generalizes the notion of ϕ-symmetric (κ, μ)-contact metric structure of Boeckx. They proved that three-dimensional locally ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifolds are of constant curvature. They show the existence of ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-manifold by using an example which is neither locally symmetric nor locally ϕ-symmetric.

In this paper, we introduce contact metric manifold, Sasakian manifold, (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold and study important properties of these spaces. We show that there exists no ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold. Then we present the example given by Jun-Yildiz-De in [7]. In [7], the authors claimed that the 3-dimensional manifold given in this example is a non-Sasakian locally ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold, which is not locally ϕ-symmetric. We show that this example is not correct and moreover we prove that there is no non-Sasakian locally ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold with dimension 3, which is not locally ϕ-symmetric. We also prove that the only flat 3-dimensional manifolds are ϕ-recurrent (k, μ)-contact metric manifolds. Finally, we show that there exists no non-flat $(2n+1)$-dimensional ϕ-recurrent (locally ϕ-recurrent) contact metric manifold of constant curvature. This assertion show that Theorem 4.1 in [7] is not correct.

---

[1] 2010 Mathematics subject Classification: 53C15, 53C40.

2 Contact Metric Manifolds

We start by collecting some fundamental material about contact metric geometry. We refer to [2], [3] for further details.

A differentiable $(2n+1)$-dimensional manifold M^{2n+l} is called a *contact manifold* if it carries a global differential 1-form η such that $\eta \wedge (d\eta)^n \neq 0$ everywhere on M^{2n+1}. This form η is usually called the *contact form* of M^{2n+1}. It is well known that a contact manifold admits an *almost contact metric structure* (ϕ, ξ, η, g), i.e., a global vector field ξ, which will be called the *characteristic vector field*, a (1, 1) tensor field ϕ and a Riemannian metric g such that

$$(i)\ \eta(\xi) = 1, \quad (ii)\ \phi^2 = -Id + \eta \otimes \xi, \tag{1}$$

$$g(\phi X, \phi Y) = g(X, Y) - \eta(X)\eta(Y), \tag{2}$$

for any vector fields on M^{2n+1}. Moreover, (ϕ, ξ, η, g) can be chosen such that $d\eta(X, Y) = g(X, \phi Y)$ and we then call the structure a *contact metric structure* and the manifold M^{2n+1} carrying such a structure is said to be a *contact metric manifold*. As a consequence of (1) and (2), we have

$$\phi\xi = 0, \quad \eta \circ \phi = 0, \quad d\eta(\xi, X) = 0.$$

Denoting by $\pounds$, Lie differentiation, we define the operator h by following

$$hX := \frac{1}{2}(\pounds_\xi \phi)X.$$

The (1, 1) tensor h is self-adjoint and satisfy

$$(i)\ h\xi = 0, \quad (ii)\ h\phi = -\phi h, \quad (iii)\ Trh = Trh\phi = 0. \tag{3}$$

Since the operator h anti-commutes with ϕ, if X is an eigenvector of h corresponding to the eigenvalue λ, then ϕX is also an eigenvector of h corresponding to the eigenvalue $-\lambda$.

If ∇ is the Riemannian connection of g, then

$$\nabla_X \xi = -\phi X - \phi h X, \tag{4}$$

$$\nabla_\xi \phi = 0, \tag{5}$$

$$g(R(\xi, X)Y, Z) = g((\nabla_X \phi)Y, Z) + g((\nabla_Z \phi h)Y - (\nabla_Y \phi h)Z, X), \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\nabla_{hX}\phi)Y = {} & -R(\xi, X)Y - \phi R(\xi, X)\phi Y + \phi R(\xi, \phi X)Y - R(\xi, \phi X)\phi Y \\ & + 2g(X + hX, Y)\xi - 2\eta(Y)(X + hX). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

A contact structure on M^{2n+1} gives rise to an almost complex structure on the product $M^{2n+1} \times R$. If this structure is integrable, then the contact metric manifold is said to be *Sasakian*. Equivalently, a contact metric manifold is Sasakian if and only if

$$R(X, Y)\xi = \eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y. \tag{8}$$

Moreover, on a Sasakian manifold the following hold

$$(\nabla_X \phi)Y = g(X, Y)\phi - \eta(Y)X, \qquad h = 0. \tag{9}$$

The (κ, μ)-nullity distribution of a contact metric manifold $M^{2n+1}(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ for the pair $(\kappa, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a distribution

$$N(\kappa, \mu) : p \longrightarrow N_p(\kappa, \mu) = \Big\{ Z \in T_pM : R(X,Y)Z = \kappa\big(g(Y,Z)X - g(X,Z)Y\big) \\ + \mu\big(g(Y,Z)hX - g(X,Z)hY\big)\Big\}.$$

A contact metric manifold $M^{2n+1}(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ with $\xi \in N(\kappa, \mu)$ is called (κ, μ)-*contact manifold*. So, for a (κ, μ)-contact manifold, we have

$$R(X,Y)\xi = \kappa(\eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y) + \mu(\eta(Y)hX - \eta(X)hY). \tag{10}$$

On a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold, $\kappa \leq 1$. If $\kappa = 1$, the structure is Sasakian ($h = 0$). For $\kappa = \mu = 0$, we have $R(X,Y)\xi = 0$. In [1], Blair proved the following.

Theorem 2.1. ([1]) A contact metric manifold M^{2n+1} satisfying $R(X,Y)\xi = 0$ is locally isometric to $E^{n+1} \times S^n(4)$ for $n > 1$ and flat for $n = 1$, where E^{n+1} is Euclidean space and $S^n(4)$ is a sphere of constant curvature 4.

In a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold, the following relations hold (see [2], [3], [7])

$$h^2 = (\kappa - 1)\phi^2, \quad \kappa \leq 1, \quad \text{and } \kappa = 1 \text{ iff } M^{2n+1} \text{ is Sasakian}, \tag{11}$$

$$(\nabla_X \eta)(Y) = g(X + hX, \phi Y), \quad S(X,\xi) = 2n\kappa\eta(X), \tag{12}$$

$$(\nabla_X \phi)(Y) = g(X + hX, Y)\xi - \eta(Y)(X + hX), \tag{13}$$

$$R(\xi, X)Y = \kappa(g(X,Y)\xi - \eta(Y)X) + \mu(g(hX,Y)\xi - \eta(Y)hX), \tag{14}$$

$$\eta(R(X,Y)Z) = \kappa(g(Y,Z)\eta(X) - g(X,Z)\eta(Y)) \\ + \mu(g(hY,Z)\eta(X) - g(hX,Z)\eta(Y)). \tag{15}$$

Definition 2.2. *A contact metric manifold $M^{2n+1}(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ is said to be locally ϕ-symmetric if*

$$\phi^2((\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z) = 0, \tag{16}$$

for all vector fields W, X, Y, Z orthogonal to ξ. If (16) holds for all vector fields W, X, Y, Z (not necessarily orthogonal to ξ), then we call it ϕ-symmetric.

The notion locally ϕ-symmetric, was introduced for Sasakian manifolds by Takahashi [9].

Definition 2.3. *A contact metric manifold $M^{2n+1}(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ is said to be ϕ-recurrent if there exists a non-zero 1-form A such that*

$$\phi^2((\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z) = A(W)R(X,Y)Z, \tag{17}$$

for all vector fields X, Y, Z, W. If the above equation holds for all vector fields W, X, Y, Z orthogonal to ξ, then we call it locally ϕ-recurrent.

These notations were introduced for Sasakian manifolds by De-Shaikh-Biswas [6] and were introduced for (κ, μ)-contact manifolds by Jun-Yildiz-De [7].

3 Existence of ϕ-Recurrent Sasakian Manifold

In [6], De-Shaikh-Biswas introduced the notation Sasakian ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold. In this section, we show that there exists no contact metric manifold of this type. Therefore this definition is not well defined.

For a Sasakian manifold, we have $h = 0$ and $\kappa = 1$. Then using (4), (12) and (15), we have the following.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $M^{2n+1}(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ be a Sasakian manifold. Then the following relations hold*

$$\nabla_X \xi = -\phi X, \tag{18}$$

$$(\nabla_X \eta)(Y) = g(X, \phi Y), \tag{19}$$

$$\eta(R(X,Y)Z) = g(Y,Z)\eta(X) - g(X,Z)\eta(Y), \tag{20}$$

$$S(X, \xi) = 2n\eta(X). \tag{21}$$

Here, we consider the contact metric manifolds with dimension 3. It is known that the Riemannian curvature of a 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold M satisfies in

$$\begin{aligned} R(X,Y)Z = g(Y,Z)QX - g(X,Z)QY + S(Y,Z)X - S(X,Z)Y \\ + \frac{r}{2}[g(X,Z)Y - g(Y,Z)X], \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where Q is the Ricci operator, that is , $g(QX,Y) = S(X,Y)$ and r is the scalar curvature of M.

Theorem 3.2. *There is no ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold with dimension 3.*

Proof. Let M be a 3-dimensional ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold. Then the Riemannian curvature of this manifold satisfies in (22). Putting $Z = \xi$ in (22) and using (21) and $\eta(\xi) = 1$, we obtain

$$R(X,Y)\xi = (2 - \frac{r}{2})[\eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y] + \eta(Y)QX - \eta(X)QY. \tag{23}$$

Then (8) and (23) give us

$$(1 - \frac{r}{2})[\eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y] = \eta(X)QY - \eta(Y)QX. \tag{24}$$

Setting $Y = \xi$ in (24) and using (21), we get

$$QX = (\frac{r}{2} - 1)X + (3 - \frac{r}{2})\eta(X)\xi, \tag{25}$$

which gives us

$$S(X,Y) = g(QX,Y) = (\frac{r}{2} - 1)g(X,Y) + (3 - \frac{r}{2})\eta(X)\eta(Y). \tag{26}$$

By (22), (25) and (26), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} R(X,Y)Z = (3 - \frac{r}{2})[g(Y,Z)\eta(X)\xi - g(X,Z)\eta(Y)\xi + \eta(Y)\eta(Z)X \\ - \eta(X)\eta(Z)Y] + (\frac{r}{2} - 2)[g(Y,Z)X - g(X,Z)Y]. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

From (27) and

$$(\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z = \nabla_W R(X,Y)Z - R(\nabla_W X, Y)Z \\ - R(X,\nabla_W Y)Z - R(X,Y)\nabla_W Z, \tag{28}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z = {}& \frac{dr(W)}{2}[g(Y,Z)X - g(X,Z)Y - g(Y,Z)\eta(X)\xi \\ & + g(X,Z)\eta(Y)\xi - \eta(Y)\eta(Z)X + \eta(X)\eta(Z)Y] \\ & + (3-\frac{r}{2})[g(Y,Z)\eta(X) - g(X,Z)\eta(Y)]\nabla_W\xi \\ & + (3-\frac{r}{2})[\eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y](\nabla_W\eta)(Z) \\ & + (3-\frac{r}{2})[g(Y,Z)\xi - \eta(Z)Y](\nabla_W\eta)(X) \\ & - (3-\frac{r}{2})[g(X,Z)\xi - \eta(Z)X](\nabla_W\eta)(Y). \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Now, let Y be a non-zero vector field orthogonal to ξ and $X = Z = \xi$. Then from (29), we have

$$(\nabla_W R)(\xi,Y)\xi = -2(3-\frac{r}{2})(\nabla_W\eta)(\xi)Y. \tag{30}$$

Since $\phi\xi = 0$, then using (19) we obtain

$$(\nabla_W\eta)(\xi) = g(W,\phi\xi) = 0. \tag{31}$$

Setting (31) in (30) yields

$$(\nabla_W R)(\xi,Y)\xi = 0. \tag{32}$$

Since M is a ϕ-recurrent manifold then there exists a non-zero 1-form A such that satisfies in (17). Thus using (17) and (32) we deduce that

$$A(W)R(\xi,Y)\xi = 0. \tag{33}$$

Since M is Sasakian manifold and Y is a non-zero vector field orthogonal to ξ, then we have

$$R(\xi,Y)\xi = \eta(Y)\xi - \eta(\xi)Y = -Y. \tag{34}$$

Setting (34) in (33) implies that $A(W)Y = 0$, which contradicts with the condition $A(W) \neq 0$. □

Theorem 3.3. *There is no ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold M^{2n+1} with $n > 1$.*

Proof. Let M^{2n+1} $(n > 1)$, be a ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold. Then using (ii) of (1) and (17), we get

$$-(\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z + \eta((\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z)\xi = A(W)R(X,Y)Z,$$

or

$$(\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z = \eta((\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z)\xi - A(W)R(X,Y)Z, \tag{35}$$

where X, Y, Z, W are arbitrary vector fields on M and A is a non-zero 1-form on M. Using Bianchi identity

$$(\nabla_W R)(X,Y)Z + (\nabla_X R)(Y,W)Z + (\nabla_Y R)(W,X)Z = 0,$$

in (35) implies that

$$A(W)R(X,Y)Z + A(X)R(Y,W)Z + A(Y)R(W,X)Z = 0.$$

Applying η to the above equation yields

$$A(W)\eta(R(X,Y)Z) + A(X)\eta(R(Y,W)Z) + A(Y)\eta(R(W,X)Z) = 0. \qquad (36)$$

By plugging (20) in (36), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A(W)[g(Y,Z)\eta(X) - g(X,Z)\eta(Y)] + A(X)[g(W,Z)\eta(Y) - g(Z,Y)\eta(W)] \\ + A(Y)[g(X,Z)\eta(W) - g(W,Z)\eta(X)] = 0. \qquad (37) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we choose the ϕ-basis $\{e_i, \phi e_i, \xi\}_{i=1}^{n}$ for M^{2n+1} $(n > 1)$. By setting $Y = Z = e_i$, $W = e_j$ $(j \neq i)$ and $X = \xi$ in (37), we obtain

$$A(e_j) = 0.$$

Since j is arbitrary, then we deduce

$$A(e_k) = 0, \quad \forall\, k = 1, \ldots, n. \qquad (38)$$

Similarly, setting $Y = Z = e_i$, $W = \phi e_j$ and $X = \xi$ in (37) implies

$$A(\phi e_j) = 0.$$

Thus we deduce

$$A(\phi e_k) = 0, \quad \forall\, k = 1, \ldots, n. \qquad (39)$$

(8) and (19) give us

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_W R)(X,Y)\xi &= (\nabla_W \eta)(Y)X - (\nabla_W \eta)(X)Y + R(X,Y)\phi W \\ &= g(W,\phi Y)X - g(W,\phi X)Y + R(X,Y)\phi W. \qquad (40) \end{aligned}$$

Putting $X = W = \xi$ in (40) and using $\phi\xi = 0$ and $g(\xi, \phi Y) = \eta(\phi Y) = 0$, we get

$$(\nabla_\xi R)(\xi, Y)\xi = 0.$$

Thus from (17) we derive that

$$0 = A(\xi)R(\xi,Y)\xi = A(\xi)[\eta(Y)\xi - Y].$$

If Y is a non-zero vector field orthogonal to ξ, then the above equation give us $A(\xi) = 0$. Thus by using (37) and (38), we deduce that $A = 0$ on M, which is a contradiction. □

By Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, we conclude the following.

Theorem 3.4. *There exists no ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifold.*

4 ϕ-Recurrent (κ, μ)-Contact Metric Manifolds

In [7], Jun-Yildiz-De presented the following example (see Section 5 in [7]).

Example 4.1. ([7]) We consider 3-dimensional manifold $M = \{(x, y, z) | x \neq 0\}$, where (x, y, z) are the standard coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Let $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ be linearly independent global frame on M given by

$$e_1 := \frac{2}{x}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \quad e_2 := 2\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{4z}{x}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + xy\frac{\partial}{\partial z}, \quad e_3 := \frac{\partial}{\partial z}.$$

Let g be the Riemannian metric defined by

$$g(e_1, e_3) = g(e_2, e_3) = g(e_1, e_2) = 0, \quad g(e_1, e_1) = g(e_2, e_2) = g(e_3, e_3) = 0.$$

Let η be the 1-form defined by $\eta(U) = g(U, e_3)$ for any $U \in \chi(M)$. Suppose that ϕ be the (1, 1) tensor field defined by

$$\phi e_1 = e_2, \quad \phi e_2 = -e_1, \quad \phi e_3 = 0.$$

Then using the linearity of ϕ and g, we have

$$\eta(e_3) = 1, \qquad \phi^2(U) = -U + \eta(U)e_3, \tag{41}$$

$$g(\phi U, \phi W) = g(U, W) - \eta(U)\eta(W), \tag{42}$$

for any $U, W \in \chi(M)$. Moreover

$$he_1 = -e_1, \quad he_2 = e_2, \quad he_3 = 0.$$

Thus for $e_3 = \xi$, $\quad (\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ defines a contact metric structure on M. Hence we have

$$[e_1, e_2] = 2e_3 + \frac{2}{x}e_1, \quad [e_1, e_3] = 0, \quad [e_2, e_3] = 2e_1.$$

The Riemannian connection ∇ of the metric g is given by

$$\begin{aligned} 2g(\nabla_X Y, Z) &= Xg(Y, Z) + Yg(Z, X) - Zg(X, Y) \\ &\quad - g(X, [Y, Z]) - g(Y, [X, Z]) + g(Z, [X, Y]). \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Taking $e_3 = \xi$ and using the above formula for Riemannian metric g, it can be easily calculated that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \nabla_{e_1} e_3 = 0, & \nabla_{e_2} e_3 = 2e_1, & \nabla_{e_3} e_3 = 0, & \nabla_{e_1} e_2 = \frac{2}{x} e_1 \\ \nabla_{e_2} e_1 = -2e_3, & \nabla_{e_2} e_2 = 0, & \nabla_{e_3} e_2 = 0, & \nabla_{e_1} e_1 = -\frac{2}{x} e_2. \end{array} \right. \tag{44}$$

By (44), it is easy to see that (ϕ, ξ, η, g) is a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold with $\kappa = -\frac{2}{x} \neq 0$ and $\mu = -\frac{2}{x} \neq 0$.

Now we show that the above example is not correct.
Using (44) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R(e_1, e_2)e_3 &= \nabla_{e_1}\nabla_{e_2} e_3 - \nabla_{e_2}\nabla_{e_1} e_3 - \nabla_{[e_1, e_2]} e_3 \\ &= 2\nabla_{e_1} e_1 - 2\nabla_{e_3} e_3 - \frac{2}{x}\nabla_{e_1} e_3 \\ &= -\frac{4}{x} e_2. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

But we have

$$R(e_1, e_2)e_3 = \kappa(\eta(e_2)e_1 - \eta(e_1)e_2) + \mu(\eta(e_2)he_1 - \eta(e_1)he_2) = 0, \tag{46}$$

because $\eta(e_1) = g(e_1, e_3) = 0$ and $\eta(e_2) = g(e_2, e_3) = 0$. Thus (46) contradicts (45).

In [3], Blair-Koufogiorgos-Papantoniou proved the following.

Lemma 4.2. ([3]) Let M^3 be a three-dimensional (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold and X be a unit eigenvector of h, say $hX = \lambda X$, X orthogonal to ξ, where $\lambda = \sqrt{1-\kappa}$. Then for $\kappa < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\xi, X] = (1 + \lambda - \frac{\mu}{2})\phi X, \quad [\phi X, \xi] = (1 - \lambda - \frac{\mu}{2})X, \quad [X, \phi X] = 2\xi, \\
&\nabla_X X = \nabla_{\phi X}\phi X = 0, \quad \nabla_X \phi X = (\lambda + 1)\xi, \quad \nabla_{\phi X} X = (\lambda - 1)\xi, \\
&\nabla_X \xi = -(1 + \lambda)\phi X, \quad \nabla_\xi X = -\frac{1}{2}\mu\phi X.
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let M^3 be a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold. Then M is ϕ-recurrent if and only if M is flat.*

Proof. Let M^3 be a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold. If $\kappa = 1$, then using Theorem 4.9 we deduce that M^3 is Sasakian. Thus by Theorem 3.2, we conclude that M^3 can not be ϕ-recurrent. Now let $\kappa < 1$ and X be a unit eigenvector of h orthogonal to ξ with corresponding eigenvalue $\lambda = \sqrt{1-\kappa} > 0$. Then, according to Lemma 4.2, there exist three mutually orthonormal vector fields ξ, X, ϕX such that

$$[X, \phi X] = 2\xi, \quad [\phi X, \xi] = (1 - \lambda - \frac{\mu}{2})X, \quad [\xi, X] = (1 + \lambda - \frac{\mu}{2})\phi X, \tag{47}$$

where $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. To simplify in computation, we set

$$\xi := e_1, \quad X := e_2, \quad \phi X := e_3, \quad c_2 := 1 - \lambda - \frac{\mu}{2}, \quad c_3 := 1 + \lambda - \frac{\mu}{2}.$$

Therefore (47) can be written as

$$[e_2, e_3] = 2e_1, \quad [e_3, e_1] = c_2 e_2, \quad [e_1, e_2] = c_3 e_3. \tag{48}$$

Since e_1, e_2 and e_3 are orthonormal, then we have $g(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij}$. Thus we obtain

$$\eta(e_2) = g(e_2, e_1) = 0, \quad \eta(e_3) = g(e_3, e_1) = 0. \tag{49}$$

Using (48), (49) and noting that $\eta(e_1) = \eta(\xi) = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
d\eta(e_3, e_2) &= -d\eta(e_2, e_3) = \frac{1}{2}\eta([e_2, e_3]) = 1, \\
d\eta(e_i, e_j) &= 0, \quad \forall (i, j) \neq (2, 3), (3, 2).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the condition $d\eta(e_i, e_j) = g(e_i, \phi e_j)$ gives us

$$\phi e_1 = 0, \quad \phi e_2 = e_3, \quad \phi e_3 = -e_2.$$

Using (43), (48) and $g(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij}$, it follows that

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_{e_1} e_1 = 0, & \nabla_{e_2} e_2 = 0, \quad \nabla_{e_3} e_3 = 0, \\ \nabla_{e_1} e_2 = \frac{1}{2}(c_2 + c_3 - 2)e_3, & \nabla_{e_2} e_1 = \frac{1}{2}(c_2 - c_3 - 2)e_3, \\ \nabla_{e_1} e_3 = -\frac{1}{2}(c_2 + c_3 - 2)e_2, & \nabla_{e_3} e_1 = \frac{1}{2}(c_2 - c_3 + 2)e_2, \\ \nabla_{e_2} e_3 = \frac{1}{2}(c_3 - c_2 + 2)e_1, & \nabla_{e_3} e_2 = \frac{1}{2}(c_3 - c_2 - 2)e_1. \end{cases} \tag{50}$$

The Riemannian curvature of ∇ is defined by

$$R(X, Y)Z = \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X,Y]} Z.$$

Using (50) and the above equation, one can obtains the following

$$R(e_2, e_3)e_2 = \frac{1}{4}[12 - 4(c_2 + c_3) - (c_2 - c_3)^2]e_3 = (\kappa + \mu)e_3, \tag{51}$$

$$R(e_2, e_3)e_3 = -\frac{1}{4}[12 - 4(c_2 + c_3) - (c_2 - c_3)^2]e_2 = -(\kappa + \mu)e_2, \tag{52}$$

$$R(e_i, e_j)e_k = 0, \quad \forall i \neq j \neq k \neq i. \tag{53}$$

Moreover, since M^3 is a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold, then using $he_2 = \lambda e_2$ and $he_3 = -\lambda e_3$, we get

$$R(e_2, e_1)e_1 = (\kappa + \mu\lambda)e_2, \quad R(e_3, e_1)e_1 = (\kappa - \mu\lambda)e_3. \tag{54}$$

Using (51), (52), (53) and (54) we have

$$(\nabla_{e_2} R)(e_2, e_3)e_3 = (\nabla_{e_3} R)(e_2, e_3)e_2 = (\nabla_{e_1} R)(e_2, e_3)e_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{55}$$

$$(\nabla_{e_2} R)(e_2, e_3)e_2 = 2(1 + \lambda)^2(1 - \lambda + \frac{\mu}{2})e_1, \tag{56}$$

$$(\nabla_{e_3} R)(e_2, e_3)e_3 = 2(\lambda - 1)^2(1 + \lambda + \frac{\mu}{2})e_1, \tag{57}$$

$$(\nabla_{e_2} R)(e_2, e_3)e_1 = -(1 + \lambda)[(\kappa + \mu\lambda)e_2 + (\kappa + \mu)e_3]. \tag{58}$$

Now, let M^3 be the ϕ-recurrent manifold. Then there exists a non-zero 1-form A on M such that (17) holds for arbitrary vector fields X, Y, Z, W on M. Thus using (17), (53) and (58), it results that

$$\phi^2\big((\nabla_{e_2} R)(e_2, e_3)e_1\big) = 0.$$

This means that

$$(1 + \lambda)[(\kappa + \mu\lambda)e_2 + (\kappa + \mu)e_3] = 0.$$

Since $\lambda > 0$, then above equation gives us $\kappa = -\mu$ and $\kappa = -\mu\lambda$. The solution of these equations yield $\kappa = \mu = 0$. Thus we have $R(X, Y)\xi = 0$ for every vector fields X and Y on M. Therefore according to Theorem 2.1 we conclude that M^3 is flat. The converse of the theorem is obvious. ☐

Now, let M^3 be a locally symmetric (ϕ-symmetric) (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold and $\kappa < 1$. Then we have $\nabla R = 0$ ($\phi^2(\nabla R) = 0$). Thus using (58), similar to the proof of the above theorem, we obtain $\kappa = \mu = 0$. Therefore we can conclude the following.

Theorem 4.4. *Let M^3 be a non-Sasakian (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold. Then M is locally symmetric if and only if M is flat.*

By the same argument used for the Theorem 4.4, we have the following.

Theorem 4.5. *Let M^3 be a non-Sasakian (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold. Then M is ϕ-symmetric if and only if M is flat.*

Since $\phi e_1 = 0$, then using (55), (56) and (57) we deduce that

$$(\nabla_{e_2}R)(e_2, e_3)e_2 = (\nabla_{e_2}R)(e_2, e_3)e_3 = (\nabla_{e_3}R)(e_2, e_3)e_2 = (\nabla_{e_3}R)(e_2, e_3)e_3 = 0.$$

Thus for every vector fields X, Y, Z, W orthogonal to ξ, it follows that

$$\phi^2((\nabla_W R)(X, Y)Z) = 0.$$

Therefore we get the following.

Theorem 4.6. *Every non-Sasakian (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold $M^3(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ is locally ϕ-symmetric.*

By the Theorems 3.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, we conclude the following.

Corollary 4.7. *There exists no 3-dimensional ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold, which is not locally symmetric (locally ϕ-symmetric or ϕ-symmetric).*

Also, from Theorem 4.6 it results the following.

Corollary 4.8. *There exists no non-Sasakian locally ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold with dimension 3, which is not locally ϕ-symmetric.*

In [3], the authors proved the following result.

Theorem 4.9. ([3]) Let M^{2n+1} be a contact metric manifold with ξ belonging to the (κ, μ)-nullity distribution. Then $\kappa \leq 1$. If $\kappa = 1$, then $h = 0$ and M^{2n+1} is a Sasakian manifold. If $\kappa < 1$, then M^{2n+1} admits three mutually orthogonal and integrable distributions $D(0)$, $D(\lambda)$ and $D(-\lambda)$ determined by the eigenspaces of h, where $\lambda = \sqrt{1-\kappa}$. Moreover,

$$R(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)Z_{-\lambda} = (\kappa - \mu)[g(\phi Y_\lambda, Z_{-\lambda})\phi X_\lambda - g(\phi X_\lambda, Z_{-\lambda})\phi Y_\lambda], \quad (59)$$

$$R(X_{-\lambda}, Y_{-\lambda})Z_\lambda = (\kappa - \mu)[g(\phi Y_{-\lambda}, Z_\lambda)\phi X_{-\lambda} - g(\phi X_{-\lambda}, Z_\lambda)\phi Y_{-\lambda}], \quad (60)$$

$$R(X_\lambda, Y_{-\lambda})Z_{-\lambda} = \kappa g(\phi X_\lambda, Z_{-\lambda})\phi Y_{-\lambda} + \mu g(\phi X_\lambda, Y_{-\lambda})\phi Z_{-\lambda}], \quad (61)$$

$$R(X_\lambda, Y_{-\lambda})Z_\lambda = -\kappa g(\phi Y_{-\lambda}, Z_\lambda)\phi X_\lambda - \mu g(\phi Y_{-\lambda}, X_\lambda)\phi Z_\lambda], \quad (62)$$

$$R(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)Z_\lambda = [2(1+\lambda) - \mu][g(Y_\lambda, Z_\lambda)X_\lambda - g(X_\lambda, Z_\lambda)Y_\lambda], \quad (63)$$

$$R(X_{-\lambda}, Y_{-\lambda})Z_{-\lambda} = [2(1-\lambda) - \mu][g(Y_{-\lambda}, Z_{-\lambda})X_{-\lambda} - g(X_{-\lambda}, Z_{-\lambda})Y_{-\lambda}], \quad (64)$$

where $X_\lambda, Y_\lambda, Z_\lambda \in D(\lambda)$ and $X_{-\lambda}, Y_{-\lambda}, Z_{-\lambda} \in D(-\lambda)$.

Then they showed the following.

Theorem 4.10. ([3]) Let M^{2n+1} be a (κ, μ)-contact metric manifold with $\kappa < 1$. Then the following hold:
(i) If $X, Y \in D(\lambda)$ (resp. $D(-\lambda)$), then $\nabla_X Y \in D(\lambda)$ (resp. $D(-\lambda)$).
(ii) If $X \in D(\lambda)$, $Y \in D(-\lambda)$, then $\nabla_X Y$ (resp. $\nabla_Y X$) has no component in $D(\lambda)$ (resp. $D(-\lambda)$).

Using (28), (63) and (i) of Theorem 4.10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_{W_\lambda}R)(X_\lambda,Y_\lambda)Z_\lambda &= [2(1+\lambda)-\mu][(\nabla_{W_\lambda}g(Y_\lambda,Z_\lambda))X_\lambda + g(Y_\lambda,Z_\lambda)\nabla_{W_\lambda}X_\lambda \\ &\quad - (\nabla_{W_\lambda}g(X_\lambda,Z_\lambda))Y_\lambda - g(X_\lambda,Z_\lambda)\nabla_{W_\lambda}Y_\lambda - g(\nabla_{W_\lambda}Y_\lambda,Z_\lambda)X_\lambda \\ &\quad + g(X_\lambda,Z_\lambda)\nabla_{W_\lambda}Y_\lambda - g(Y_\lambda,Z_\lambda)\nabla_{W_\lambda}X_\lambda + g(\nabla_{W_\lambda}X_\lambda,Z_\lambda)Y_\lambda \\ &\quad - g(Y_\lambda,\nabla_{W_\lambda}Z_\lambda)X_\lambda + g(X_\lambda,\nabla_{W_\lambda}Z_\lambda)Y_\lambda] \\ &= [2(1+\lambda)-\mu][(\nabla_{W_\lambda}g)(Y_\lambda,Z_\lambda)X_\lambda - (\nabla_{W_\lambda}g)(X_\lambda,Z_\lambda)Y_\lambda] \\ &= 0. \qquad (65)\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (28), (64) and (i) of Theorem 4.10, it follows that

$$(\nabla_{W_{-\lambda}}R)(X_{-\lambda},Y_{-\lambda})Z_{-\lambda} = 0.$$

Therefore we have

Lemma 4.11. *Let M^{2n+1} be a (κ,μ)-contact metric manifold. Then ∇R vanishes on $D(\lambda)$ and $D(-\lambda)$, i.e., we have*

$$(\nabla_{W_\lambda}R)(X_\lambda,Y_\lambda)Z_\lambda = 0, \quad (\nabla_{W_{-\lambda}}R)(X_{-\lambda},Y_{-\lambda})Z_{-\lambda} = 0.$$

Now, we are going to consider the existences of ϕ-recurrent (κ,μ) contact metric manifold M^{2n+1} with $n>1$.

Theorem 4.12. *There is no ϕ-recurrent (κ,μ) contact metric manifold M^{2n+1} $(n>1)$.*

Proof. Let M^{2n+1} $(n>1)$, be a ϕ-recurrent (κ,μ)-contact metric manifold. Then (36) holds. Setting (15) in (36), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&A(W)[\kappa\{g(Y,Z)\eta(X)-g(X,Z)\eta(Y)\}+\mu\{g(hY,Z)\eta(X)-g(hX,Z)\eta(Y)\}] \\ &+A(X)[\kappa\{g(W,Z)\eta(Y)-g(Z,Y)\eta(W)\}+\mu\{g(hW,Z)\eta(Y)-g(Z,hY)\eta(W)\}] \\ &+A(Y)[\kappa\{g(X,Z)\eta(W)-g(W,Z)\eta(X)\}+\mu\{g(hX,Z)\eta(W)-g(hW,Z)\eta(X)\}] \\ &=0. \qquad (66)\end{aligned}$$

Let $\{e_i,\phi e_i,\xi\}_{i=1}^{n}$ be an orthonormal ϕ-basis with $e_i\in D(\lambda)$. By plugging $Y=Z=e_i$, $W=e_j (j\neq i)$ and $X=\xi$ in (66), we get

$$A(e_j)(\kappa+\mu\lambda)=0. \qquad (67)$$

Similarly, setting $Y=Z=e_i$, $W=\phi e_l$ and $X=\xi$ in (66) we obtain

$$A(\phi e_l)(\kappa+\mu\lambda)=0. \qquad (68)$$

By using Lemma 4.11 and (17), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\phi^2((\nabla_{e_j}R)(e_i,e_k)e_k)=A(e_j)R(e_i,e_k)e_k=[2(1+\lambda)-\mu]A(e_j)e_i,\ \ i\neq k, \\ 0&=\phi^2((\nabla_{\phi e_l}R)(\phi e_i,\phi e_k)\phi e_k)=A(\phi e_l)R(\phi e_i,\phi e_k)\phi e_k \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad =[2(1-\lambda)-\mu]A(\phi e_l)\phi e_i,\ \ i\neq k.\end{aligned}$$

The above equations give us

$$A(e_j) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \mu = 2(1+\lambda), \tag{69}$$

$$A(\phi e_l) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \mu = 2(1-\lambda). \tag{70}$$

Now we consider all of cases that would be occur for A.

Case 1: Let A be non-zero on both of $D(\lambda)$ and $D(-\lambda)$. Then there exist $1 \leq j, l \leq n$ such that $A(e_j) \neq 0$ and $A(\phi e_l) \neq 0$. In this case, using (69), (70) we deduce $\lambda = 0$ which is a contradiction.

Case 2: Let A be non-zero on $D(\lambda)$ and zero on $D(-\lambda)$. Then there exist $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $A(e_j) \neq 0$. In this case, using (67) and (69) we derive that $\kappa + \mu\lambda = 0$ and $\mu = 2(1+\lambda)$. A simple substitution yields $\lambda = -1$ which is a contradiction.

Case 3: Let A be zero on both of $D(\lambda)$ and $D(-\lambda)$. Since A is a non-zero 1-form, then $A(\xi) \neq 0$. Since $g(e_i, \xi) = 0$, then $g(\nabla_\xi e_i, \xi) = 0$. Thus $\nabla_\xi e_i$ has no component with respect ξ. Therefore we can write

$$\nabla_\xi e_i = a_i^r e_r + b_i^r \phi e_r. \tag{71}$$

Using (71), (59), (62) and (63) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_\xi R)(e_j, e_k)e_s = {} & [2(1+\lambda) - \mu]\big[(\delta_{ks} b_j^r - \delta_{js} b_k^r)\phi e_r + a_j^s e_k - a_k^s e_j + a_s^j e_k \\ & - a_s^k e_j\big] + \big[\kappa b_j^s \phi e_k + \mu b_j^k \phi e_s - \kappa b_k^s \phi e_j - \mu b_k^j \phi e_s + \kappa b_s^j \phi e_k \\ & - \kappa b_s^k \phi e_j - \mu b_s^j \phi e_k + \mu b_s^k \phi e_j\big].\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

By $g(e_j, e_k) = \delta_{jk}$ and (71), we get

$$a_j^k + a_k^j = 0.$$

Then (72) reduce to the following

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_\xi R)(e_j, e_k)e_s = {} & [2(1+\lambda) - \mu](\delta_{ks} b_j^r - \delta_{js} b_k^r)\phi e_r + (k b_j^s + k b_s^j - \mu b_s^j)\phi e_k \\ & - (\kappa b_k^s + \kappa b_s^k - \mu b_s^k)\phi e_j + \mu(b_j^k - b_k^j)\phi e_s.\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Using (17), (63) and (73), we deduce that $\mu = 2(1+\lambda)$.

Since $\nabla_\xi \xi = 0$, then

$$(\nabla_\xi R)(\xi, Y)\xi = \kappa(\nabla_\xi \eta)(Y)\xi + \mu[h(\nabla_\xi Y) - \nabla_\xi hY]. \tag{74}$$

Using the first part of (12) implies that

$$(\nabla_\xi \eta)(Y) = g(\xi + h\xi, \phi Y) = g(\xi, \phi Y) = \eta(\phi(Y)) = 0.$$

By setting the above equation in (74), one can obtains

$$(\nabla_\xi R)(\xi, Y)\xi = \mu[h(\nabla_\xi Y) - \nabla_\xi hY]. \tag{75}$$

On the other hand, (71) gives us

$$h(\nabla_\xi e_i) = \lambda(a_i^j e_j - b_i^j \phi e_j), \quad \nabla_\xi h e_i = \lambda(a_i^j e_j + b_i^j \phi e_j). \tag{76}$$

Setting $Y = e_i$ in (75) and using (76) we get

$$(\nabla_\xi R)(\xi, e_i)\xi = -2\mu\lambda b_i^j \phi e_j,$$

which gives us

$$\phi^2\big((\nabla_\xi R)(\xi, e_i)\xi\big) = 2\mu\lambda b_i^j \phi e_j.$$

Using (10), (17) and the above equation we have

$$(\kappa + \mu\lambda)A(\xi)e_i + 2\mu\lambda b_i^j \phi e_j = 0.$$

Since $A(\xi) \neq 0$, then from the above equation we deduce that $\kappa + \mu\lambda = 0$. As we see in Case 2, this contradicts $\mu = 2(1 + \lambda)$.

Case 4. Let A be non-zero on $D(-\lambda)$ and zero on $D(\lambda)$. Then there exists $1 \leq l \leq n$ such that $A(\phi e_l) \neq 0$. In this case, by (68) and (70) we have $\kappa + \mu\lambda = 0$ and $\mu = 2(1 - \lambda)$ which yield $3\lambda^2 - 2\lambda - 1 = 0$. This equation and the condition $\lambda > 0$ give us $\lambda = 1$. Thus we have $\kappa = \mu = 0$.

Now, we compute $(\nabla_{\phi e_l} R)(e_i, e_j)e_k$. Since $g(\nabla_{\phi e_l} e_i, \xi) = -g(e_i, \nabla_{\phi e_l}\xi) = 0$, then $\nabla_{\phi e_l} e_i$ has no component with respect ξ. Also, from Theorem 4.10 we deduce that $\nabla_{\phi e_l} e_i$ has no component in $D(-\lambda)$. Thus we can write

$$\nabla_{\phi e_l} e_i = \Gamma_{li}^r e_r, \tag{77}$$

where $\Gamma_{li}^r = g(\nabla_{\phi e_l} e_i, e_r)$. From (77) and considering $g(e_i, e_r) = \delta_{ir}$, we obtain

$$\Gamma_{li}^r = -\Gamma_{lr}^i. \tag{78}$$

Using (63), (77), (78) and noting $\kappa = \mu = 0$, it follows that

$$(\nabla_{\phi e_l} R)(e_i, e_j)e_k = 0. \tag{79}$$

By using (17), (63) and (79), we deduce that $A(\phi e_l)(\delta_{jk} e_i - \delta_{ik} e_j) = 0$ which gives $A(\phi e_l) = 0$ that contradicts the assumption.

According to the above cases, the proof is completes. □

In [2], Blair proved the following.

Theorem 4.13. ([2]) If a contact metric manifold M^{2n+1} is of constant curvature c and $n > 1$, then $c = 1$ and the structure is Sasakian.

Now, we are going to prove the following.

Theorem 4.14. *There is no non-flat $(2n+1)$-dimensional ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold of constant curvature.*

Proof. Let M^{2n+1} be a non-flat ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold. If $n > 1$, then according to Theorems 3.4 and 4.13, the proof is obvious. Now let $n = 1$, i.e., let M be a 3-dimensional non-flat ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold. If M has the constant curvature $c \neq 0$, then we have

$$R(X, Y)Z = c(g(Y, Z)X - g(X, Z)Y). \tag{80}$$

Similar to (65), from (28) and (80) we get

$$(\nabla_W R)(X, Y)Z = 0. \tag{81}$$

Putting $Y = Z = \xi$ in (17) and using (80) and (81) it follows that

$$cA(W)[X - \eta(X)\xi] = 0.$$

If X is a non zero vector field orthogonal to ξ, then the above equation gives us $cA(W)X = 0$, which is a contradiction to $c \neq 0$ and $A(W) \neq 0$. $\square$

Now, we are going to consider the existences of locally ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold of constant curvature.

Theorem 4.15. *There is no non-flat $(2n+1)$-dimensional locally ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold of constant curvature.*

Proof. Let M^{2n+1} be a non-flat locally ϕ-recurrent contact metric manifold. If M has the constant curvature $c \neq 0$, then (80) holds. Therefore, similar to Theorem 4.14, we deduce that

$$(\nabla_W R)(X, Y)Z = 0. \tag{82}$$

Let $\{e_i, \phi e_i, \xi\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, be an orthonormal ϕ-basis for M^{2n+1}. Putting $Y = Z = e_i$ and $X = e_j$ $(j \neq i)$ in (17) and using (80) and (82), we obtain $cA(W)e_j = 0$, which is a contradiction to $c \neq 0$ and $A(W) \neq 0$. $\square$

References

[1] D.E. Blair, *Two remarks on contact metric structures*, Tohoku. Math. J. **29**(1977), 319-324.

[2] D. E. Blair, *Riemannian Geometry of Contact and Symplectic Manifolds*, Progress in Math., Birkhäuser, Boston, 2002.

[3] D.E. Blair, T. Koufogiorgos and B.J. Papantoniou, *Contact metric manifolds satisfying a nullity condition*, Israel. J. Math. **91**(1995), 189-214.

[4] E. Boeckx, *A class of locally ϕ-symmetric contact metric spaces*, Arch. Math. **72**(1999), 466-472.

[5] E. Boeckx, P. Buecken and L. Vanhecke, *ϕ-symmetric contact metric spaces*, Glasg. Math. J. **41**(1999), 409-416.

[6] U. C. De, A. A. Shaikh and S. Biswas, *On ϕ-recurrent Sasakian manifolds*, Novi. Sad. J. Math. **33**(2003), 13-48.

[7] J.B. Jun, A. Yildiz and U.C. De, *On ϕ-recurrent (κ, μ)-contact metric manifolds*, Bull. Korean. Math. Soc., **45**(2008), 689-700.

[8] M. Okumura, *Some remarks on spaces with a certain contact structure*, Tohoku. Math. J. **14**(1962), 135-145.

[9] T. Takahashi, *Sasakian ϕ-symmetric spaces*, Tohoku. Math. J. **29**(1977), 91-113.

Esmaeil Peyghan
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science
Arak University
Arak 38156-8-8349, Iran
Email: epeyghan@gmail.com

Akbar Tayebi
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science
University of Qom
Qom. Iran
Email: akbar.tayebi@gmail.com